II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are herein respectfully requested.

Claims 10-14 are pending in the application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,574,025 to Juaire et al. ("Juaire"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

As recited in the claims, the present invention is for a method of forming a wall panel with first and second polymer sheets, the second polymer sheet being formed with a substantially smooth central region without ribs over substantially the *entire width and length* of the second polymer sheet. Additionally, the claims (particularly claim 13) recite joining a plurality of said panels to form a portable toilet. This construction with a substantially smooth central region solves many of the problems associated with cleaning the interiors of portable toilets.

In rejecting the claims, the examiner refers to Figure 1 of Juaire, asserting that the bottom sheet of Figure 1 shows a smooth central region over substantially the entire length and width of the second sheet. It is respectfully submitted that this interpretation is incorrect since the illustration of Juaire's Figure 1 is a cross-sectional view. Being a cross-sectional view, it cannot show the inner sheet of Juaire in both the length and width directions. It can only show Juaire in a single direction, namely the width, not the length. Nowhere in Juaire is the inner sheet shown in a manner to allow one to know it s shape over its length. To presume that it is smooth over its substantial entire length is respectfully submitted as being impermissible conjecture.

Further, a general review (and measurements) taken of Figure 1 clearly indicates that the smooth central region of Juaire's inner surface is only about half of the width of the panel. It is submitted that "approximately half of a width" is not "substantially the entire width" as recited in the claims. While the term "substantial" is a relative term, it is noted that it is used in the claims conjunction with the term

"entire". The connotation of their use together negates an interpretation of "about half".

Regarding the examiner's reference to Figure 4, the above arguments are also applicable. The cross-sectional view of Figure 4 fails to show both any length considerations of the door panel and the substantial entire width of the illustrated door panel is not occupied by a substantially smooth central region.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinct over the art of record. Allowance of the claims is therefore warranted and requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 17, 2008 /Eric Sosenko/
Date Eric J. Sosenko, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,440)